

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/978,596

Applicant(s)

MORI ET AL.

Examiner

Alicia M Harrington

Art Unit

2873

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alicia M Harrington.

(3) David Ward.

(2) Georgia Epps.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02 April 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Arai (6,411,108), Kim (6,337,841) and Ueda (6,418,108).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant proposed an amendment to claims 1 and 3 to overcome the 112 second paragraph rejection by defining in the claim that the curvature of the collimator lens corrects coma aberration; and the prior art of record fails to disclose the curvature of the collimator lens corrects for coma by increasing correct aberration as the distance from the radial center of the lens increases. A similar amendment to independent claim 7 and 11 will be present upon filing a response to the office action.